

Eron king

(b) (6)

12/15/2011 11:55 AM

To Richard Kauffman

cc Clare Howard, Marijana Gee, Elizabeth Allen,
"esseneinfo@aol.com Owen", ffeldstein, Gary Hale,
"jae.p.douglas@state.or.us DOUGLAS", BISHOP Karen,
"keo1@cdc.gov (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB) Orloff"

bcc

Subject Re: Note from Clare Howard, NOW QUESTIONS FROM
ERON

I actually had to walk away from the computer due to being so emotionally disturbed by your response. I have my own responses below... I have lost a lot of confidence in this study.
I have a video of Dr. Barr. You will hear her talk of Big Chemical trying to influence what was done at CDC while she worked there.
-Eron

On Dec 15, 2011, at 10:53 AM, Kauffman.Richard@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> Hello Eron,
>
> Thank you for your questions.
>
> I understand and appreciate your concerns over having unwanted chemicals
> in the bodies of you and your children. There are powerful emotions
> involved on all sides of this issue and none of us want to minimize
> anyone's concerns. I also do not want toxic chemicals in my body or
> those of my family. The fact is that we live in an industrial society
> that has allowed the dumping of wastes into the environment for
> centuries, and those chemicals are everywhere.
THIS IS AN EXCUSE, ONE THAT I THOUGHT YOU WERE ABOVE.
> If we look, we will find
> chemicals in our bodies. I work with communities in the remote regions
> of the arctic, who are finding that they have levels of PCBs, and other
> persistent organic pollutants, coming from thousands of miles away, at
> concentrations in their food and bodies much higher than the general
> population. Because of the presence of so many chemicals in the
> environment and our bodies, one of the first tools we utilize in
> evaluating data results in specific populations is a comparison to the
> general population.

MY POINT WAS THAT YOU CHANGED THE MOTIVE OF THIS STUDY!!

> Not because we approve of the existence of those
> chemicals in the body, but because this comparison allows us to take
> into account the multitude of exposure sources that most people in
> western society have (e.g. clothing, building materials, store bought
> food, consumer products, electronics, furniture, transportation etc.).
> We need to be able to identify and address additional exposures that are
> resulting from unique community situations, which in this case are
> nearby pesticide applications.

NOW YOU HAVE YOUR PROOF... POSITIVE FOR 2,4-D.

> We will be performing a more health
> based evaluation of the results in our upcoming Exposure Investigation
> and Public Health Assessment documents.
>

> Those of us at ATSDR and OHA and other public health and environmental

> regulatory agencies across the country are doing what we can to identify
> and prevent exposures. Most of us are working in these agencies because
> we care about these issues and want to make a difference. I don't feel
> that I am allowing these exposures to occur. In the broadest sense,
> these exposures are occurring as a result of the social and cultural
> values held by the majority of citizens in western society, and economic
> conditions under which our present world is defined.

THIS IS OUTRIGHT BULLSHIT. THESE EXPOSURES ARE BECAUSE
BIG TIMBER AND CHEMICAL HAVE THEIR CLAWS IN THE U.S.

GOVERNMENT AND NO ONE WANTS TO STAND UP AND STOP IT!!!!

YOU ALL MIGHT CARE, BUT WHO IS GOING TO STAND UP AND
STOP THIS POISONING OF OUR CHILDREN...WHO?? YOU, RICHARD
KAUFFMAN? HOW ABOUT YOU JAE DOUGLAS..?

YOU ALL HAVE AUTHORITY IN ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, STAND
UP AND FIGHT FOR WHAT IS RIGHT. DON'T TELL ME TIMBER ISN'T
INFLUENCING WHAT IS GOING ON HERE!!

> We want to sample
> the urine of residents in your area this spring to develop
> scientifically valid data which can be used by the public health and
> regulatory agencies to reduce exposures and improve the quality of life
> for everyone in the community.

ONLY AFTER ALLOWING THEM TO POISON OUR CHILDREN AGAIN!

HOW CAN THAT BE CONSTITUTIONALLY LEGAL??

> All of us are committed to improving the
> conditions of the populations we serve, but we need to follow the
> "rules" of the system we live in,

WHAT RULES ARE BIG TIMBER GOING BY...? THEY SEEM TO GO
AROUND THE RULES ALL THE TIME AND NO ONE STOPS THEM!!!!!!!

> and work under the authorities granted
> to us by the political and economic system that defines conditions in
> this country.

CHANGE THE RULES!!!!!! MAKE A DECISION, MAKE THE CALL, ARE YOU ALL AFRAID OF
LOSING YOUR JOBS, CAUSE IF THAT'S THE CASE, THEN THERE IS INFLUENCE.

> Since our system does not operate under the precautionary
> principle, strong scientifically defensible information is needed to
> affect change.

THERE IS PLENTY OF SCIENTIFICALLY DEFENSIBLE INFORMATION
OUT THERE... YOU ALL CHOOSE TO IGNORE IT!!!!!!!

SEARCH YOUR HEART FOR WHAT IS RIGHT, WE ONLY NEED SO MANY
PEOPLE TO STAND UP. WHEN THEY SEE YOUR STRENGTH, THEY TOO
WILL STAND UP FOR WHAT'S RIGHT.

WE ARE LARGER THAN THE TIMBER INDUSTRY, AND YOU ALL
KNOW THINGS NEED TO CHANGE.

>

> In regards to your Atrazine results:

>

> Table 7 indicates that only ATSDR and OHA will have access to the urine
> "raw data".

>

> It is not clear to me what you are looking for in regards to "raw data",
> but the only thing ATSDR and OHA have in our possession for Atrazine is
> an excel spreadsheet which includes:

> "samplename" (unique identifier/sample number),
> "analytename" (e.g. Atrazine mercapturate),
> "finalamount" (e.g.. <LTSD),
> "comment" (e.g. Code 5 (Turbid),<LSTD(0.0615)),
> analytecode (e.g. "ATZ" for Atrazine mercapturate), and
> "date" (that the sample was analyzed).

> This is the "raw data" that we have.
>
> No traces of Atrazine under the level of detection are provided for any
> sample in the data table, so it is not possible for Ken to have told
> anyone that there was. There were some 2,4-D results reported under the
> level of detection in the 2,4-D spreadsheet, so it is possible that the
> other participant heard this about his 2,4-D results and presumed that
> the same was true for Atrazine. As far as I know, you have in your
> possession all the data available for your urine sample and those of
> your children who were tested..
>
> I hope this has been helpful.
>
> Regards,
>
> Richard
>
>
> CAPT Richard R. Kauffman, M.S.
> Senior Regional Representative
> Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry
> 1200 6th Ave., ATS-197
> Seattle, WA 98101
> Cell (b) (6)
> Office (206) 553-2632
> www.atsdr.cdc.gov
> fax (206) 553-2142
> RKauffman@cdc.gov
>
>
>
> From: Eron king (b) (6)
> To: Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
> Cc: "esseneinfo@aol.com Owen" <esseneinfo@aol.com>, Clare Howard
> (b) (6), Marijana Gee
> (b) (6), ffeldstein@cdc.gov,
> "jae.p.douglas@state.or.us DOUGLAS"
> <jae.p.douglas@state.or.us>, "keol@cdc.gov
> (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB) Orloff" <keol@cdc.gov>, Elizabeth
> Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Hale (b) (6)
> BISHOP Karen <karen.bishop@state.or.us>
> Date: 12/14/2011 08:41 PM
> Subject: Re: Note from Clare Howard, NOW QUESTIONS FROM ERON
>
>
>
> Hello All,
> I feel because I have been privy to your conversations I can express a
> few
> questions here. First however, thank you Capt. Kauffman for answering
> many
> questions we all have out here. You have been very patient and
> educational.
> I want to start by pointing to that same table that you mention below on
> page
> 7 of the protocol document. On that table it states that several
> agencies will
> receive access to the raw data. I too would like to see my families raw
> data. I was told in an earlier email that there was no other "raw data".
> In a

> conversation with another participant in the study, I found out that in
> his
> phone call to Orloff he was told that he had traces of atrazine in his
> system,
> but it was under the level of detection, therefore not shown on our lab
> analysis we received in the mail. I want to know my numbers, I have
> children
> that are positive for these poisons, and you can't tell me that isn't
> interfering
> with their developing bodies. I care, even if their numbers are below
> the level of detection.
> And surely I am also privy to my children's own medical information.
> Also you stated on page 3 (and several other pages) of that same
> protocol
> that "the data will be specific to participants in the investigation,
> and are not intended to be generalized to the wider community or other
> populations". However in our letters we received, on the bottom of the
> first page
> after (1) it compares us to averages in the NHANES study,
> and states that our test results are "within the typical range of
> exposure.
> What is the typical range of exposure for a 6 year old? Can you point me
> to a study
> assuring me that both my 6 and 11 year olds will not suffer any health
> affects when
> they are my age! Actually you state several times throughout the
> document how you will be comparing our data to other data sets, some
> that aren't
> even health based, rather population based. You are contradicting
> yourselves I feel.
> On the second page of the letter we received it states that "Atrazine
> and
> it's breakdown products were not detected in your urine sample". After
> such contradictions, and information through other participants
> concerning
> atrazine levels, I would like to see that raw data. I was told through
> other
> professionals that we have a right to this information. Can you tell me
> what
> I and others can do to access that information?
> Another thing that troubles me and several others is the fact that we
> now know
> (again for some) that we are getting exposed to 2,4-D, and maybe even
> atrazine, just
> below the level of detection. What do you say you are going to do
> now....? You
> tell us that you will come in and sample in the spring, gathering data
> after the sprays.
> The problem with that you see, is we are now supposed to accept that you
> are
> letting them poison our children again so that you can collect your
> data.
> After finding that we all, or most of us have been poisoned, shouldn't
> there be a mandate issued stopping all spray until the pathway of
> exposure is revealed? Why continue the poisoning of our children?
> Wouldn't every single one of you be a little more than troubled that
> your still
> developing children are being exposed to chemicals on a regular basis???
> Thank you all for your time and help on this delicate issue, we
> appreciate it

> greatly.
>
> Eron King
>
>
>
> On Dec 14, 2011, at 12:25 PM, Kauffman.Richard@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
>
>> Good morning Day,
>>
>> I apologize for my delayed response, but was out of the office
>> yesterday.
>>
>> If you had asked me your question at the open house on November 18th,
> I
>> would have told you that the upcoming Exposure Investigation report on
>> the urine results will be authored by ATSDR in cooperation with OHA.
>> This is also clearly stated in the Protocol available at the OHA
>> website. This protocol document also describes the fact that some of
>> the environmental samples would be analyzed by the ODA lab (Table 2,
>> page 7, and 2nd to last paragraph on page 8) and these results
> QA/QC'd
>> by EPA to ensure the integrity of the results (attachment B, Section D
>> starting at page 16). I will leave it to EPA to describe why they are
>> confident that the ODA laboratory generated data will be valid and
>> useable.
>>
>> In response to your questions below:
>>
>> 1) The primary author of the report is Ken Orloff, ATSDR with
> co-authors
>> David Farrer, Sujata Joshi, Jae Douglas, & Karen Bishop of OHA. I am
> a
>> reviewer of the document along with several others in the ATSDR
>> headquarters office, including Ken's supervisor Susan Moore of the
>> Exposure Investigation & Site Assessments Branch, Rick Gillig and
> Audra
>> Henry of the Cooperative Agreement & Program Evaluation Branch,
>> personnel from ATSDR's Office of Science, and likely others in the
> chain
>> of command at ATSDR/NCEH including one or more Division Directors.
>>
>> 2) CDC has a world-wide reputation for integrity and is considered the
>> world's leading scientific public health institution. While I cannot
>> say that CDC is impervious to political influence, I see no signs that
>> industry is exerting any influence on the work ATSDR/CDC is performing
>> in the Highway 36/Triangle Lake investigations.
>>
>> 3) I have limited familiarity with Oregon's Right to Farm and Forest
>> Laws, and cannot speak to their potential influence on PARC's role in
>> these investigations, however, these laws have no influence over the
>> work of ATSDR and EPA, and I see no evidence of any negative influence
>> on the work being performed by the above mentioned OHA staff, of which
>> all are or were working in positions at OHA funded by ATSDR under our
>> Cooperative Agreement Program.
>>
>> We care about the health of everyone in the community, and are working
>> hard to insure that the results of our investigations are accurate,
>> scientifically defensible, and help us answer concerns about exposures
>> to pesticides in the Highway 36/Triangle Lake area.

>>
>> Regards,
>>
>> Richard
>>
>> CAPT Richard R. Kauffman, M.S.
>> Senior Regional Representative
>> Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry
>> 1200 6th Ave., ATS-197
>> Seattle, WA 98101
>> Cell (b) (6)
>> Office (206) 553-2632
>> www.atsdr.cdc.gov
>> fax (206) 553-2142
>> RKauffman@cdc.gov
>>
>>
>>
>> From: esseneinfo@aol.com
>> To: Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
>> Cc: (b) (6)
>> (b) (6), jae.p.douglas@state.or.us,
> keol@cdc.gov,
>> ffeldstein@cdc.gov
>> Date: 12/12/2011 05:07 PM
>> Subject: Re: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from
Peoria,
> IL
>>
>>
>>
>> Richard and all:
>> I must be blunt: At the public meeting put on by PARC recently at
>> Triangle Lake School, I was told -- by more than one agency rep at the
>> meeting -- that it was you who would be writing that March report; it
>> was that assurance that caused me to feel pretty good about the
> chances
>> that Triangle Lake pesticide exposure victims would finally get an
>> honest, 'best science' study, so long deserved. Now, coming on the
> heels
>> of the stunning revelation that the physical samples taken by the
>> federal EPA were not given to a lab affiliated with the EPA or
> analyzed
>> by EPA scientists, but instead were immediately put into the hands of
>> the Oregon Department of Agriculture and their lab. The problem with
>> that should be obvious: That lab cannot possibly be considered
> unbiased
>> in this matter, nor can the Oregon Department of Agriculture, being
>> under such heavy influence of the pesticide makers like Dow and
> Monsanto
>> via Oregonians for Food and Shelter and similar industry groups. But
>> rather than argue the merit of that lab, let me point out what I want
> to
>> be blunt about: THERE SEEMS TO BE A BIT OF "SMOKE AND SCREENS" going
> on,
>> an attempt to hide the fact that the fox is investigating the loss of
>> eggs in the hen-house! To be really blunt: Putting the Pesticide
>> Division of the Oregon Department of Agriculture -- whose very mission
>> statement includes a clause about maintaining the availability of
>> pesticides -- in charge of the physical evidence collected by the EPA

> is
>> ludicrous! Thus, I hereby make several official requests of you,
>> Captain Richard Kauffman of the Agency for Toxic Substances and
> Disease
>> Registry (ATSDR is part of CDC and works with EPA).
>>
>> Specific Official Requests:
>>
>> 1) Can you -- and will you -- now provide me with the names and agency
>> affiliations of each author of specific sections of the report on the
>> pesticide investigation due out in March? If so, please include
> contact
>> information for them.
>>
>> 2) I trust you, Captain Kauffman, but I know little of your parent
>> agency, the CDC (Center for Disease Control), and thus bluntly ask: In
>> your honest opinion, since CDC is headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia,
> and
>> since there is a strong timber lobbying group in that region, is it
>> possible that the same multinational corporations that are literally
>> 'pulling the strings' in Oregon are capable of applying pressure on
> the
>> CDC headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia? If so, have you seen any signs
> or
>> felt any pressures from Atlanta that you are comfortable sharing with
>> us?
>>
>> 3) Have you read the eight or so statutes collectively called 'The
>> Oregon Right to Farm and Forest Laws? If so, do you feel that those
> laws
>> affect in a negative or positive way the investigation of Triangle
> Lake
>> pesticide exposures by PARC?
>>
>> Thanks, Richard, and one more thing: I am still working on assembling
>> one or more scientists/experts to interface with you and other agency
>> reps per our previous communication on that topic.
>>
>> -- Day Owen, on behalf of myself and a number of other community
> members
>> concerned about the health and well-being of our children.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Kauffman.Richard <Kauffman.Richard@epamail.epa.gov>
>> To: esseneinfo <esseneinfo@aol.com>
>> Cc: clarehoward (b) (6) ; danandmaya
>> (b) (6) ; spiralmom (b) (6) ; jae.p.douglas
>> <jae.p.douglas@state.or.us>; keol <keol@cdc.gov>; ffeldstein
>> <ffeldstein@cdc.gov>
>> Sent: Mon, Dec 12, 2011 6:01 am
>> Subject: Re: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from Peoria, IL
>>
>> Hello Day, et. al.
>>
>> This is an excellent question, and one we are working to address as we
>> develop our protocol for spring sampling. It is our intent to be as
>> timely as possible in collecting post-spray samples. The details

> still
>> need to be worked out.
>>
>> One clarification: I am part of a team including ATSDR headquarters
>> staff and OHA staff which is developing the exposure investigation
>> report. Most of the actual report writing is being done by others.
>>
>> Regards,
>>
>> Richard
>>
>> CAPT Richard R. Kauffman, M.S.
>> Senior Regional Representative
>> Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry
>> 1200 6th Ave., ATS-197
>> Seattle, WA 98101
>> Cell (b) (6)
>> Office (206) 553-2632
>> www.atsdr.cdc.gov
>> fax (206) 553-2142
>> RKauffman@cdc.gov
>>
>>
>>
>> From: esseneinfo@aol.com
>> To: (b) (6),
>> (b) (6), Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
>> Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
>> Date: 12/09/2011 03:08 PM
>> Subject: Re: Note from Clare
Howard, journalist
> from Peoria,
>> IL
>>
>>
>>
>> In response to your question, Clare: About 66 people from
>> thirty-something households. Just got our results. All I can say right
>> now is that lots of people I have talked to are showing up positive
> this
>> time for 2,4-D but not atrazine, including my wife, Neila. That
> actually
>> strengthens our position with the investigating scientists in that it
>> was known that atrazine was not sprayed this fall around the time of
>> their testing, but 2,4-D was. In Neila's case, her current reading on
>> 2,4-D is way higher than her previous level with Dr Barr's test. Now,
>> what the scientists will do -- they have told me -- is to watch and
> see
>> if, the next time atrazine is sprayed and they go in and test quickly
>> afterward, if we who are now negative in our current baseline samples
>> are then positive for atrazine: BINGO!
>>
>> In the above paragraph the clause that is the key is: "they go in and
>> test quickly afterward".
>> If their process and methodology is set-up to do a quick response to
>> news that a spray that may involve atrazine is going to take place,
> then
>> they will likely find atrazine above whatever they have now found in
> the

>> August baseline sample.
>>
>> I have included in the recipients of this email one of the most
>> significant government agency reps involved with the current study,
>> Captain Richard Kauffman of CDC.
>> It is Richard that will write the official government report linked to
>> the recent OHA-led urine tests. RICHARD, for the benefit of Clare, a
>> freelance reporter who is interested in this current investigation and
>> recently visited my home researching an atrazine-related article, can
>> you respond to the comments I made in the two above paragraphs,
>> especially speaking to the question raised in paragraph two above:
> Will
>> the process and methodology of the investigative team be able to make
>> quick tactical decisions to respond to where atrazine may be sprayed
> in
>> the spring? And if so, do you intend to do that? -- Day Owen
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Clare Howard (b) (6)
>> To: esseneinfo <esseneinfo@aol.com>
>> Sent: Thu, Dec 8, 2011 11:37 pm
>> Subject: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from Peoria, IL
>>
>> Dear Day,
>> I hope you and Neila are doing well. Good to hear from you. Did you
> and
>> Neila get your results yet? Who is paying for this round of urinalysis
>> testing and how many people participated this time?
>> My editor is currently in discussions with The New York Times.
>> Yes, I will send the email again listing contacts. I have an
> additional
>> contact as well. When will you schedule the teleconference? Can I
>> listen in on the call?
>> Best regards,
>> Clare
>>
>> From: esseneinfo@aol.com
>> Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2011 6:22 PM
>> To: (b) (6)
>> Subject: Re: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from Peoria, IL
>>
>> HI Clare!
>> Although individuals will get their urine test results by mail during
>> December, the cumulative results -- which is what we would need to
>> really say anything about it -- won't be available until March.
>> Do you yet know what publication your editor is at first going to try
>> for?
>> The book idea is great!
>> GOOD NEWS: The government folks doing the testing have agreed to my
>> request to hold a teleconference with whatever experts I wish to
>> provide.
>> Could you please reply to this email with the names and contact info
> of
>> several possible experts again? I can't find that previous email from
>> you and fear that it was deleted.
>> Blessings, Day
>>

>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Clare Howard (b) (6)
>> To: esseneinfo <esseneinfo@aol.com>
>> Sent: Wed, Dec 7, 2011 4:13 am
>> Subject: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from Peoria, IL
>>
>> Dear Day,
>>
>> Hope you and Neila are doing well.
>>
>> My material has been through the first edit and I'm waiting to hear
>> back. This waiting is difficult.
>>
>> Do you know when the results of the follow-up urinalysis testing will
> be
>> released. Could you let me know the results. You would be interested
>> that a researcher I quote in my article said she expects if urinalysis
>> testing were done in the Midwest, we'd have the same or higher
> results.
>> A scientist in the European Union talked to me about the history
> behind
>> the EU ban and said ultimately, scientists concluded atrazine couldn't
>> safely be used even under ideal conditions following label directions.
>>
>> I will get my article to you as soon as it's published and I hope you
>> will find it useful.
>>
>> My best,
>>
>> Clare
>>
>> PS: My editor suggested turning the article into a book. I'd love to
> do
>> that and will look for possible funding sources.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>
>
>